

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/748,430	12/26/2000	Kwan-Lae Kim	5000-1-182	4460	
33942	7590 10/04/2004		EXAMINER		
CHA & REITER, LLC 210 ROUTE 4 EAST STE 103			BELLO, AGUSTIN		
PARAMUS, 1			ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			2633		

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/748,430	KIM ET AL.
,	Examiner	Art Unit
	Agustin Bello	2633
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 25 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated at the control of the control o	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	Brief must be filed within the pe	eriod set forth in f the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would to canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a) will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided below	⊠ will be entered and an word wor appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-15.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appropriate the drawing correction filed on is a drawing correction filed on	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
0. Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner has noted the deficiencies of Tai in the Final office action and has taken the position that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Tai to include the claimed limitaitons. Furthermore, the examiner has provided a suggetion in the prior art and motivation for modifying the device of Tai. Moreover, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claime invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In response to applicant's concerns regarding claims 12-15, the examine inadvertantly left the new claims out of the position taken on page 5 second paragraph. The second paragraph should have read "Regarding claims 4-15." and not "Regarding claims 4-11." Likewise the beginning of section 2 should read "Claims 1-15 are rejected ...

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600